



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AT this writing it is still undecided whether the Chicago Board of Education will move back into the sixteenth century, or remain in the nineteenth. A good many different kinds of feelings have been excited by the proposal of the board to cut the salaries of the teachers in the high schools. It is pleasant to see that the teachers are not without friends, that there are some people, many people, left in Chicago who prefer that men and women shall be treated justly and honestly, even though they be teachers. The paltry sum to be saved by the cut made the cry of economy ring hollow in all ears. To carry out its ideas of the Reform Committee fully the board should pass the cut ordinance, and then revive the mediæval German law forbidding masters to teach in their shirt sleeves. This ordinance was necessary because the salaries were so low teachers could not afford to wear coats, and if left to their own devices, went without coats and bought bread. The remedy then was not more salary, but a law so burdensome that under it the celebrated poet and teacher, Hugo von Trimberg, wore the same coat thirty years. There would be joy on the part of some who are not angels if such a delightful state of affairs could be brought about in Chicago. What a pity it is that this imperial city is so poor that it must seriously propose to abandon the attempt to keep up with the advance guard. The patriotism of those who favor this scheme is like that of Eli Perkins' Uncle Consider, who so brimmed over with loyalty to the flag that he would leave the front of battle often and go miles to the rear just to rally round the flag awhile all by himself.

Later: The cut has failed. Chicago refuses to advance backwards. Our congratulations to the teachers.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL LITERATURE

A SCHOOL OF ORATORY. BISHOP JOHN H. VINCENT. *The Chautauquan*, January 1896.

CRIMINAL CROWDING OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS. JAMES H. PENNIMAN. *Forum*, January 1896.

THE SCHOOLHOUSE AS A CENTER. HORACE E. SCUDDER. *Atlantic Monthly*, January 1896.

THE STUDY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH. PROFESSOR GEORGE M. HEMPL. *The Chautauquan*, January 1896.

STUDIES OF CHILDHOOD. XIV. THE CHILD AS ARTIST. By JAMES SULLY. *Popular Science Monthly*, January 1896.

THE STUDY OF CURRENT HISTORY. By A. S. JOHNSON, Ph.D. *Ohio Educational Monthly*.

Not the least among the benefits of the study of current history is the

abundance of the illustrations it affords the teacher for impressing the truths of the text-book lessons—illustrations which at once excite and retain the attention of pupils. This is particularly noticeable in the teaching of geography and history. By connecting some interesting event of recent occurrence with the geographical features of each country, attention is at once aroused and memory strengthened. To take one example—from one well-conducted lesson on the recent festivities connected with the opening of the Baltic and North Sea canal, pupils can be taught more of what is useful for them to know about the geography of northern Germany and its adjacent waters, and the political relations of the countries of central Europe, than they could be expected to learn from a week's perusal of a formal text-book. And in the teaching of history, those important practical truths which are the chief value of the study, and which remain with us as the fruit of the experience of the past while the details of fact are lost in unavoidable oblivion—these truths receive their most graphic illustration, and make their strongest personal appeal to the springs of action within us, when they can be associated with familiar names, places and events of our own day. This ever-living interest in the present thus tends to develop within us a disposition to go beneath the mere external facts of history in search of the mightier tendencies of which those facts are but exponents, and aids us to grasp that conception of history which makes it a teacher of the present out of the wealth of the past.

FOREIGN NOTES.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON AND THE BOARD SCHOOLS. *The Journal of Education* [London], January 1896.

THE Bishop of London's attempt to prove his statement as to wasteful expenditure on the part of School Boards has drawn him into a curious statement. He says: "The voluntary schools are ceasing to be as good as the board schools, but that is not because the board schools are really the better, but because the voluntary schools are the worse." The rest of this letter from which we quote is equally obscure. But we gather that the bishop would reduce salaries under large boards in order to prevent the best teachers from being attracted to the towns. The *Pall Mall* seems to approve this view, in a very misleading article. We quote one sentence as an example of irresponsible journalistic flippancy. "By all means," says the *Pall Mall*, "let board-school teachers be paid adequate salaries, but not at the rate of cabinet ministers." This is, of course, a well-known figure in rhetoric. The salaries of the London Board range from £50 to £400. Cabinet ministers pocket from £2000 to £5000, and there is no article of the constitution which condemns plurality. The Bishop of London's official salary is £10,000. As Headmaster of Rugby he received about half that sum. We are not arguing